



Application No.: 09/806,304
Examiner: Ryan FLANDRO
Art Unit: 3679

REMARKS

1. In the Specification

Applicant submits a substitute specification which corrects the informalities noted by the Examiner in the Office Action. Specifically, Applicant would like to point out that the substitute specification replaces terms such as "infeed corner piece" with "corner piece", "mould" with "side member", "cavities" with "attachment channels", and "infeed part" with "insert part". Additionally, "part 30" has been renamed "inclined part 30" and "part 40" has been renamed "resilient member 40" to correspond to their new recitation in the new claims. Approval of the substitute specification is respectfully requested.

2. In the Claims

Applicant has rewritten original claims 1-28 as new claims 29-52. Applicant submits that claims 29-52 overcome the informalities noted in the Office Action and comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In order to assist the review of the new claims, Applicant has provided below a claim concordance chart that describes which claims correspond to the original claims.

New Claim	Relation to Original Claims
29	claim 1 and 2
30	claim 1 and 3
31	claim 1 and 4
32	claim 1 and 5
33 (dependent on claim 32)	claim 6
34 (dependent on claim 31)	claim 7
35	claim 1 and 8
36	claim 1, 9 and 12

RECEIVED

FEB 05 2003

GROUP 3600

37 (dependent on claim 36)	claim 10
38 (dependent on claim 36)	claim 11
39 (dependent on claim 36)	claim 13
40 (dependent on claim 36)	claim 14
41 (dependent on claim 32)	claim 15
42 (dependent on claim 36)	claims 15 and 16
43 (dependent on claim 42)	claim 17
44	claims 1 and 18
45	claims 1 and 19
46	claims 1, 20 and 21
47	claim 1 and 22
48 (dependent on claim 29)	claim 23
49	claim 1 and 24
50 (dependent on claim 49)	claim 25
51	claims 1, 9 and 27
52	claim 1 and 28

As indicated in the Office Action, claims 2-4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 18, 21, 22, 24 and 28 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and to include the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims from which they depend. Applicant has rewritten claims 2-4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 18, 21, 22, 24 and 28 to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and, as can be seen from the claim concordance chart, include the limitations of the base claim from which they depend. Accordingly, removal of their rejection is respectfully requested.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 29-32, 34-35, 37-38, 40, 44, 46-47, 50 and 52 are in condition for allowance.

3. Rejection of claims 1, 9, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, 20, 23, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by German Patent 43 05 377 (Hustadt et al.)

In view of the new claims, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It should be pointed out that new claim 36, which corresponds at least in part to new claim 36, recites that at least one of the insert parts includes a locking part arranged to extend near a first side of an attachment channel and an inclined part extending inclined relative to both a longitudinal axis of the attachment channel and the locking part. The inclined part is recited as extending along the attachment channel to a predetermined point located further away from the connecting end of the insert part than the locking part. Furthermore, claim 36 recites that the inclined part defines a leg that extends to connect with another leg connecting to the locking part.

It should be pointed out that Hustadt et al. does not disclose or suggest an inclined part that extends at an incline through an attachment channel and further is formed as a leg that connects to another leg that in turn connects to the locking part. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 39 and 42-43, either directly or indirectly dependent from claim 36, are likewise patentable in view of their dependency from claim 36 and their individual structural elements.

Claim 41 corresponds to original claim 15 and is dependent on claim 32 which contains subject matter considered that will be discussed below in connection to new claim 32 corresponding to original claim 5. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the discussion below.

Claim 45 corresponds to original claim 19 and is drafted in independent form. Specifically, claim 45 recites that each insert part includes a leg extending from the one end of the insert part and arranged to extend into an attachment channel along an inner surface thereof. The insert part includes a locking part arranged to lock with an outer surface of the attachment channel. Furthermore, a clearance is recited as being defined between the outer surface of the attachment channel and the insert part when the corner part is inserted into at least one attachment channel. The clearance

generally extending from the locking part to at least the connecting end of the insert part.

Applicant submits that Hustadt et al. fails to disclose or suggest the clearance recited in claim 45. Specifically, in observing FIG. 3, there is clearly no clearance at the corner portion of the corner piece in Hustadt et al. This is particularly evident in that the legs 5 are generally disposed in regions near the corner 2. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

The subject matter of original claim 20 was incorporated into claim 21 containing allowable subject matter.

Claim 48 corresponds to original claim 23 and is dependent from claim 29 which contains subject matter that was considered allowable in the Office Action.

The subject matter of original claim 26 was deleted in its entirety.

Claim 51 corresponds to original claim 27 and further incorporates the subject matter of claim 36. Claim 51 is directed to a corner piece having the insert parts recited in claim 36. For reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that Hustadt et al. fails to disclose or suggest the corner piece of claim 51.

4. Rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by German Patent (Kreusel)

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of new claim 32 corresponding to original claim 5.

Claim 32 relates to a corner joint of the type whereby a lip 13 is pressed inwardly, thereby generating with its end 21 a force on a contact side 20. The lip further co-laterally cooperates with the stop parts 23. This particular configuration allows that the position of the lips 13 is always accurately defined by the stop parts 23, therefore resulting in that the obtained pressing force is no longer dependent on the accuracy of

the pressing action, and furthermore that the forces generated by the ends 21 onto the contact sides 20 are always in a predetermined direction, which optimizes the stability of the corner joint.

Applicant submits that Kreusel does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 32. Specifically, Kreusel discloses a corner joint that is distinctly of a different construction than the corner joint of the present application in which no contact sides 20 are used; the frontly directed sides of the ends of the bend lips in Kreusel do not contact any side of the corner piece.

Accordingly, Kruesel does not disclose or suggest the corner joint of claim 32 of the present invention. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Claim 33, which directly depends from claim 32, is also patentable based on its dependency from claim 32 and its individually recited structural elements.

5. Conclusion

In view of the new claims and foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that claims 29-52 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

Application No.: 09/806,304
Examiner: Ryan FLANDRO
Art Unit: 3679

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicants' Attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: January 31, 2003

S:\Producer\jek\BROCHEZ - 806304\amendment.wpd

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Justin J. Cassell", with a stylized, cursive script.

JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,205